

REMARKS

Examination is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

5

Disposition of Claims

Claims 1-4 and 6-21 remain pending in the instant application. Specifically, claims 1-4 and 11 have been withdrawn from consideration in view of the Examiner's restriction requirement, while claims 12-21 have been either rejected or objected to in view of prior art cited by the Examiner. Finally, claims 6-10 have been allowed, while claim 5 has been previously cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

10

Examiner's Interview

A telephonic interview was conducted on October 19, 2006 with Examiner Paul M. West and Examiner Hezron Williams as well as the Applicant Jeffrey Merwin and the Applicant's representative, Ari M. Bai.

15

Substance of Examiner's Interview

During the telephonic interview conducted with the Examiners, the Applicant and the Applicant's representative, discussed the allowability of independent claims 12 and 21 in view of the cited prior art. In particular, the Applicant pointed out to the Examiners that the newly amended claim limitation of a "delay on make" operation was neither taught nor suggested by the cited prior art. In response, the Examiners agreed that the John, Raphael or the Murray references cited in the Office Action did not render claim 12 unpatentable; however, the Examiners stated that this newly amended limitation would require new consideration by the Examiner and that an additional search of the prior art would have to be conducted. As such, a request for continued examination would have to be filed in order to consider the newly amended claim limitation to claim 12.

20

25

30

In addition, the Applicant explained the differences between independent claim 21 and the Pankow reference cited by the Examiner; namely, the Pankow reference fails to teach or suggest processing of a sensed signal, for purposes of signaling, in at least a pair of separate signal paths for responding to respective different polarities of the bipolar signal sensed by the probe, nor does the reference disclose the limitation of signaling in response only to proper operation of both of the at least a pair of signal paths as presently claimed by the Applicants in claim 21. The Examiner agreed that claim 21 and the Pankow reference differ, and that the Examiner simply needs to ensure that the difference between the claim and the reference has been captured by the language of claim 21. In a later phone conference with the Examiner, Examiner West confirmed that the language of claim 21 does capture this difference and that the claim is allowable over the cited prior art.

CONCLUSION

By the present response, the Applicant has provided a formal written reply containing the substance of the telephonic interview with the Examiner related to the prosecution of the above-identified patent application.

The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney collect if he has any questions related to the Applicant's remarks.

Respectfully submitted,

11/27/06
Date

/Ari M. Bai/
Ari M. Bai, Reg. No. 38,726
Polsinelli Shalton Welte Suelthaus, PC
100 South Fourth Street
Suite 1100
St. Louis, Missouri 63102-1825